



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,680	03/05/2002	Jiang Hsieh	120335	7220

7590

03/27/2006

John S. Beulick  
Armstrong Teasdale LLP  
Suite 2600  
One Metropolitan Square  
St. Louis, MO 63102-2740

EXAMINER

SULLIVAN, JULIANNE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3737

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed September 27, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Regarding Applicant's arguments with respect to Florent et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,594,845), Applicant's attention is directed to the reference at column 2, lines 42-62 and column 5, lines 39-47. There, Florent et al. specifically discloses the use of projections in the method of image processing.

In response to Applicant's argument that Florent et al. is nonanalogous art, in that Florent et al. states that its methods can be applied to surveillance systems, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Florent et al. teaches a method of processing a digital image, which techniques one of ordinary skill in the art of image processing would understand are equally applicable to the projections and images as taught in the Mattson et al. reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,229,934), based on the need to find simplified means of processing images. Further, with respect to Applicant's argument that the reconstruction performed in Florent et al. is substantially different from that of the present application, the Examiner notes that Florent et al. was not relied upon in the Office Action, dated July 27, 2005, to teach the limitation of reconstruction of the images.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, there is motivation to combine the references based on the previously cited need for simplified means of image processing, which minimizes both cost and time necessary to produce quality images (see for motivation Toth et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,115,487, at col. 1, lines 56-59 and Florent et al. at col. 2, lines 32-38).

3. Regarding Applicant's arguments with respect to Moore et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,222,104), the Examiner notes that this reference was not relied upon in the Office Action, dated July 27, 2005, to teach the limitation of scaling an error-candidate projection with an error fraction, nor was Moore et al. cited in the rejections of Claims 4 and 16.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-12, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,229,934) in view of Snyder et al. (U.S.

Patent No. 5,923,775), Labaere et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,717,791) and Toth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,487), and further in view of Florent et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,594,845).

Mattson et al. teaches a method and computer, which is used in a CT system having a radiation source and detector array, for reconstructing an image that includes producing an error projection using a gradient image, where the error projection is produced by forward projecting the gradient along a projection view angle, where the error projection is used to construct an error image and where a final image is generated by subtracting the error image from the original image (col. 3, lines 11-14 and 18-24, col. 4, lines 49-64, col. 5, lines 8-10 and col. 6, lines 13-17 and 34-38). Mattson et al. does not teach using an estimated gradient to generate the gradient image, where the gradient image represents a variation of the high density object in z, where the gradient is produced by comparing three or more images with some threshold value, or using a segmentation technique to produce different gradient images, where the technique involves using different threshold values for different classes of objects.

In the same field of endeavor, Snyder et al. teaches a gradient estimation system that is used to estimate a gradient by comparing three or more images to a threshold value to produce a gradient image, which can then be used in image reconstruction (col. 1, lines 65-67, col. 2, lines 8-9 and 14-20 and col. 3, lines 29-35). Snyder et al. further teaches the use of a segmentation technique to produce different gradient images where the segmentation technique provides a plurality of threshold values (col. 3, lines 40-44 and col. 5, lines 25-52). Also in the same field of endeavor, Labaere et al. teaches the use of gradient images corresponding to sharp variations, such as between tissue and bone (col. 1, lines 60-67 and col. 2, lines 1-4 and 53-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the

Art Unit: 3737

techniques of Snyder et al. to produce the gradient images, such as those in Labaere et al., used in Mattson et al. to estimate and reduce the noise or artifacts in images and thereby improve image quality (see for motivation Mattson et al. at col. 1, lines 7-15 and the title, Snyder et al. at col. 1, lines 21-30 and 60-61 and col. 3, lines 29-38 and Labaere et al. at col. 2, lines 64-67).

Mattson et al., Snyder et al. and Labaere et al. also do not teach that the error candidate image is scaled based upon the view angle or that it is helically weighted. In the same field of endeavor, Toth et al. provides a correction method where the error image is scaled corresponding to the angle and a method using helically weighted error data (col. 2, lines 13-21, 42-46 and 54-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have scaled or weighted the error image of Mattson et al. with the method of Toth et al. in order to improve the error correction process (see for motivation Toth et al. at col. 6, lines 24-39).

Mattson et al., Snyder et al., Labaere et al. and Toth et al. teach all of the features of the present invention except for expressly stating that the scaling of the error projection was based upon the projection view angle, center view angle, pitch and size of the detector array. In the same field of the endeavor, Florent et al. teaches an image processing method, using projections, where scaling is based upon the panning angle, the center angle, the tilting angle and the size (col. 2, lines 42-62 and col. 5, lines 39-47). Here, the Examiner has interpreted the dependence of the scaling on the number of pixels in the target array as equivalent to Applicant's use of detector array size. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the scaling scheme from Florent et al. in the scaling method of Toth et al. in order to reduce the complexity of the image processing method (see for motivation Toth et al. at col. 1, lines 56-59 and Florent et al. at col. 2, lines 32-38).

Art Unit: 3737

6. Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattson et al. in view of Snyder et al., Labaere et al., Toth et al. and Florent et al., as applied to Claims 4 and 16 above, and further in view of Moore (U.S. Patent No. 4,222,104).

Mattson et al. in view of Snyder et al., Labaere et al., Toth et al. and Florent et al. teaches all of the features of the present invention except for explicitly stating that the forward projection of the gradient is either a fan beam or parallel beam forward projection. In the same field of endeavor, Moore teaches that parallel beam forward projections are very well known in image processing techniques (col. 7, lines 12-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have generated the error image from the gradient image through the use of a parallel beam forward projection in order to provide a simple procedure for the generation of the image (see for motivation Moore at col. 4, lines 8-19).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julianne M. Sullivan whose telephone number is 571-272-6084. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3737

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JMS



BRIAN L. CASLER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700